

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/754,550 | . 01/12/2004 | Jang-Ho Cho | 2557-000198/US | 9268 |
| | 7590 12/19/2006 CKEY & PIERCE, P.L | EXAMINER | | |
| P.O. BOX 8910 |) | GEIB, BENJAMIN P | | |
| RESTON, VA 20195 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2181 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 12/19/2006 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|
| 10/754,550 | CHO, JANG-HO | CHO, JANG-HO | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| Benjamin P. Geib | 2181 | | | |

| | Benjamin P. Geib | 2181 | |
|---|---|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the d | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>27 November 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS | S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F | OR ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: | wing replies: (1) an amendment, aft tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (| idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejecti | on. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.3 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origor than three months after the mailing date. | of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi | iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | ns of the date of te appeal. Since |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beto. | nsideration and/or search (see NO ow); | TE below); | |
| appeal; and/or | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | | ected claims. | • |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 | | | (====) |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | | ompliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). | | | • |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | II be entered and an e | explanation of |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | ů. |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | it before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidat | otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i | ot be entered s necessary and |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe | al and/or appellant fa | ils to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attac | hed. |
| 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | | n condition for allowa | nce because: |
| 13. Other: | SUPE | FRITZ FLEMING RVISORY PATENT EXA CHNOLOGY CENTER | MINER |
| | TE | CHINOLOGY CENTERY | 100b |

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

The proposed amendments raise new isssue that would require further search and consideration:

As noted by the Applicant, (at page 7 of the remarks) the amendments to independent claims 1 and 13 are similar to limitations found in claims 7 and 19. Although the amendments are similar to limitations found in claims 7 and 19, they are not the same and, therefore, would require further search and consideration. Furthermore, the amendment does not place claims 7 and 19 into independent form as would be necessary to incorporate the limitations of claims 7 and 19 into an independent claim without requiring further search and consideration of dependent claims.

The amendment does not simply the issues for appeal by raising the following issues:

- 1) U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, indefinitness regarding claim 1 amendment of "occupied" to "associated"
- 2) U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, antecedent basis regarding:
- a) claim 1 and claim 13 amendments of "the weighted instruction count for the thread" (a plurality of threads are previously mentioned and, therefore, "the thread" is unclear)
 - b) claim 2 amendment of "an instruction" to "the instruction"

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to Applicant's argument that the constant Cn is not the same thing as cycle counts, the Examiner notes that the Applicant appears to be reading the limitation "cycle counts" too narrowly. The limitation "cycle counts" has not been explicitly and deliberately defined within the specification. Absent an explicit and deliberate definition within the specification, the Examiner is entitled to give "cycle counts" its broadest reasonable interpretation. The constants Cn of Emer are constants that are used to determine weighted thread counts for a particular cycle and, therefore, are cycle counts as claimed.